

Department of Transportation
Olympia, Washington 98504

August 12, 2005

ATTENTION: All Short-Listed Proposers

Request For Proposals
I-405, SR 520 to SR 522 Stage 1
Design-Build Project

Addendum No. 3

The Instructions To Proposers for this project is amended as follows:

1. On page 4 of 76, Section 1.7, **Procurement Schedule**, is revised as follows:

Action	Date
Issue Draft RFP	March 22, 2005
Mandatory Draft RFP Meeting	April 11, 2005
Draft RFP One-On-One Meetings	April 12-May 13, 2005
Issue Final Draft RFP	May 31, 2005
Voluntary Proposer Meetings	May 17-July 15, 2005
Request for Supplemental Boring Deadline	June 9, 2005
ATC Submittal Deadline	July 22, 2005
Distribute Supplemental Boring Results	July 1, 2005
Issue RFP	July 15, 2005
Proposer Questions Due (tentative)	August 24, 2005
Issue Final Addendum (tentative)	August 19, 2005
Proposal Due Date (tentative)	September 1, 2005
Announce Apparent Best Value	September 21, 2005
Notice to Proceed (estimated)	October 14, 2005
Final Permit Issued	July 22 August 5, 2005

2. On page 45 of 76, Section 4.4, **Evaluation of the Technical Proposal**, the last sentence of the bulleted paragraph for the description of an **Excellent** rating is revised as follows:

“There is ~~no~~ very little risk that the Proposer would fail to meet the requirements of the ~~RFP~~ Design-Build Contract.”

3. On page 45 of 76, Section 4.4, **Evaluation of the Technical Proposal**, the last sentence of the bulleted paragraph for the description of a **Very Good** rating is revised as follows:

“There is ~~very~~ little risk that the Proposer would fail to meet the requirements of the ~~RFP~~ Design-Build Contract.”

4. On page 45 of 76, Section 4.4, **Evaluation of the Technical Proposal**, the last sentence of the bulleted paragraph for the description of a **Good** rating is revised as follows:

“The Proposer demonstrates a reasonable probability of meeting the requirements of the ~~RFP~~ Design-Build Contract.”

Chapter 1 General Provisions for this project is amended as follows:

5. On page 32 of 203, Section 1-03.15(2), **EPD Documentation**, in the third sentence, the reference to “EPF” is revised to read “EDP”.
6. On page 32 of 203, Section 1-03.15(3), the heading for this section is revised to read **“Submittal of EPD Documentation”**.
7. On page 40 of 203, Section 1-04.4(3), **Category A and Category B Changes**, the table included in the second paragraph is revised as follows:

Contract Requirement Designation	Change Category
Chapter 1 General Provisions	Category A
Chapter 2 Technical Specifications - Mandatory Standards (Except the Standard Specifications)	Category A
Chapter 2 Technical Specifications - All except Mandatory Standards	Category B
Standard Specifications	Category B
RFP Appendix B1 - Special Provisions	Category B
RFP Appendix B2 - Amendments to the Standard Specifications	Category B
Proposal Documents	Category A
Basic Configuration	Category A

8. Page 72 of 203, **Section 1-06.7(6), Table 4 – Price Adjustment Factors**, is replaced with the attached.
9. On pages 132 through 141 of 203, Section 1-08.3, **Contract Schedule**, all references to “baseline Contract Schedule” are revised to read “Baseline Contract Schedule”.

10. On page 153 of 203, Section 1-08.11(1).1, **Purpose and Amount of Incentive Award**, the first sentence of the first paragraph is revised as follows:

“An incentive award program has been established to provide the Design-Builder the opportunity to earn awards commensurate with superior performance in certain components of the Project relating to construction. “

11. On page 153 of 203, Section 1-08.11(1).1, **Purpose and Amount of Incentive Award**, the last two sentences in the third paragraph titled, **Periodic Award Earnings**, are deleted and replaced with the following:

“The amount potentially available for each quarter for any given Periodic Incentive category will be determined by dividing the Maximum Possible Award for a category by the total number of quarters (1 quarter = 3 months) of Project construction. For purposes of the aforementioned calculation, the duration of Project construction will be measured from the actual start of physical construction in the field running through to Physical Completion. For planning purposes, the first planned incentive period will be the first full quarter following the start of construction with all further incentive periods running quarterly thereafter.”

12. On page 154 of 203, Section 1-08.11(1).1, **Purpose and Amount of Incentive Award**, the sixth paragraph under **Determination and Payment of Periodic Incentive Award** is revised as follows:

General. The Periodic Incentive evaluation process shall have a two-tiered organization: the Award Determination Official (ADO) and the Performance Evaluation Team. Periodic Incentive evaluations will not begin until the actual start of physical construction.

13. On page 156 of 203, Section 1-08.11(2).2, **Environmental Compliance**, the first paragraph is revised as follows:

“Adhering to the environmental commitments, relative to all phases of project development, will prevent environmental degradation, reduce work delays and cost increases, minimize negative publicity and reduce the number of upset citizens/landowners. The portion of the incentive award allocated to Environmental Compliance is up to \$300,000. This is the maximum amount that can be earned from all environmental compliance criteria combined. The maximum amount is divided among the six three environmental compliance criteria, as shown in Table 9.”

14. On page 156 of 203, Section 1-08.11(2).2, **Environmental Compliance**, the heading ***Evaluation of Environmental Compliance Criteria*** and the two paragraphs following are deleted in their entirety.

15. On pages 156 and 157 of 203, Section 1-08.11(2).2, **Environmental Compliance**, Part **A) Environmental Awareness (Maximum \$50,000)** is deleted and replaced with the following:

A) Environmental Awareness (Maximum \$50,000)

General: This incentive rewards the Design-Builder for taking extra steps to ensure that project staff and sub-contractors understand the environmental commitments and are able to recognize when a non-compliance event is occurring and will react accordingly. To be eligible for this incentive, the Design-Builder must develop an environmental notebook containing environmental commitments and permit conditions as a resource for project inspectors. This field guide is a tool that, when combined with “Just in Time” training, will raise environmental awareness, and reduce the likelihood of a violation.

Period Incentive Award Earned: The environmental notebook will be evaluated on a monthly basis. In determining the quarterly incentive award earned, the evaluation team will consider the Monthly Evaluation Reports for that quarter.

Evaluation Criteria:

The environmental notebook will be reviewed for the following information:

- List of project staff contact numbers, including emergency contacts.
- A copy of the WSDOT Environmental Compliance Assurance Procedure for Construction Projects and Activities (Instruction Letter 4055.02) is included.
- Punch Lists and/or Check Lists of commitments applicable to specific work activities, specific locations, and/or specific daily or seasonal work schedules are included.
- Construction schedule and list of dates and conditions for advance notification to WSDOT for construction activity, so WSDOT can contact the appropriate regulatory agencies within the timeframes required in the permits.
- Water quality monitoring calibration and data sheet.
- Procedures for unanticipated discovery of archaeological and historical objects during construction.
- SPCC Plan Periodic Inspection Form.
- Inspector’s Daily Report (IDR) to record inspection activities, findings, and recommendations relative to environmental commitments.
- TESC inspection checklist(s) included.

Failure to include any of the above referenced items in the environmental notebook will result in a reduction in the quarterly incentive amount earned. The Design-Builder will receive a greater portion of this incentive if their environmental protection training program includes a component to continually teach inspectors and field staff how to use the project environmental notebook. One example of this would include training staff, prior to construction, to recognize “notification triggers” identified in the Environmental Compliance Assurance Procedure for Construction Projects and Activities (Instruction Letter 4055.02). Another example could include familiarizing staff, sub-consultants and subcontractors with the locations of environmentally sensitive areas and identifying work activities that present the greatest risk for non-compliance.

16. On pages 157 and 158 of 203, Section 1-08.11(2).2, **Environmental Compliance**, Part **B) Environmental Inspections and Compliance Monitoring (Maximum \$150,000)** is deleted and replaced with the following:

B) Environmental Inspections and Compliance Monitoring (Maximum \$150,000)

General: This incentive rewards the Design-Builder for taking extra steps to carry out well planned and rigorous environmental inspections and compliance monitoring in order to avoid permit violations and negative impacts to the environment.

Period Incentive Award Earned. Environmental Inspections and Compliance Monitoring will be evaluated on a monthly basis. In determining the quarterly incentive award earned, the evaluation team will consider the Monthly Evaluation Reports for that quarter.

Evaluation Criteria:

WSDOT's Environmental Compliance Assurance Inspector (ECAI) will perform random, unannounced inspections during the life of the Project. The inspection will be conducted using a checklist containing evaluation criteria based on the requirements identified in Table 9A below. The frequency of inspections will vary as the nature of work changes during the life of the Project. The items listed in Table 9A are meant to cover all anticipated types of work activities. Consequently, not all listed items will be applicable at all times during each inspection. The ECAI will provide the results of the random inspections to the PET to assist in the preparation of the Monthly Evaluation Reports.

17. On page 159 of 203, Section 1-08.11(2).2, **Environmental Compliance**, the Header, **Table 1 Environmental Compliance Inspection Criteria** is revised as follows:

<p style="text-align: center;">Table 1 9A Environmental Compliance Inspection Criteria</p>

18. On pages 160 and 161 of 203, Section 1-08.11(2).2, **Environmental Compliance**, Part **C) Reacting to Non-Compliance Events (Maximum \$100,000)** is deleted and replaced with the following:

C) Reacting to Non-Compliance Events (Maximum \$100,000)

General: WSDOT wants to encourage and reward the Design-Builder for self-identifying non-compliance events and for quickly reacting to report and correct such problems. This will require effective compliance planning and a commitment to rigorous monitoring, reacting, and reporting.

Period Incentive Award Earned. Unlike the other Periodic Incentives in this Section 1-08.11, this incentive will be awarded in two increments of \$50,000 maximum each. The first award, if any, will be made on December 31, 2006 and the second award, if any, will be made on December 31, 2007. The PET will review the criteria for this incentive on a monthly basis and prepare Monthly Evaluation Reports. At the end of the year, the PET will then use the Monthly Evaluation Reports to prepare a Period Incentive Award Performance Report which will be handled in the same manner and form as the Quarterly Incentive Award Performance Reports provided elsewhere in this Section 1-08.11

Evaluation Criteria: For each construction season, the Design-Builder will be reviewed and by the PET classified under one of following three performance levels for purposes of determining the range of incentive award, if any, amounts earned for that season.

Performance Level 1: Self-Identified or WSDOT-Identified Non-Compliance Event(s) (eligible to receive 51%-100% of incentive)

When evaluating this incentive, a higher percentage will be awarded to the Design-Builder for self-identifying non-compliance events and for having very few non-compliance events brought to their attention by WSDOT. A lower percentage of this incentive will be awarded if there is a high ratio of WSDOT identified non-compliance events compared to the number of non-compliance events the Design-Builder self-identified. Some examples of award scenarios are listed below:

(Upper Range)

The Design-Builder's staff, through rigorous monitoring and inspections, identified that they were in non-compliance with a permit condition(s). WSDOT was immediately notified of non-compliance event(s) in accordance with the Environmental Compliance Assurance Procedures (ECAP) and the Design-Builder coordinated with WSDOT to ensure the appropriate corrective actions were taken to resolve the problem to the satisfaction of WSDOT and the regulatory agencies. WSDOT identified very few non-compliance events that slipped by the Design-Builder's staff.

(Middle Range)

The Design-Builder self-identified non-compliance events and WSDOT's staff, on several occasions, identified that the Design-Builder was in non-compliance with a given permit condition, environmental commitment, or regulation. However, the Design-Builder always took immediate corrective action to resolve the non-compliance event(s) to the satisfaction of WSDOT and the regulatory agencies.

(Lower Range)

WSDOT had to tell the Design-Builder on numerous occasions that they were in non-compliance with environmental regulations. The Design-Builder did a fair job of self-identifying non-compliance events. The Design-Builder responded to non-compliance events, but was typically slow to react.

Performance Level 2: External Agency-Identified Non-Compliance Event(s) (eligible to receive 26%-50% of the incentive)

(Upper Range)

On no more than one occasion, an external source such as a regulatory agency environmental staff member or a local jurisdiction staff member identified that the Design-Builder was in non-compliance with a given permit condition, performance standard, environmental commitment, or regulation. The Design-Builder took immediate corrective action to resolve the non-compliance event to the satisfaction of the external party who identified the problem.

(Lower Range)

On more than one occasion, an external source such as a regulatory agency environmental staff member or a local jurisdiction staff member identifies that the Design-Builder was in non-compliance with a given permit condition, performance standard, environmental commitment, or regulation. The Design-Builder responded to non-compliance events, but was typically slow to react.

Performance Level 3: Regulatory Agency Issues a Violation and/or Failure to react to Non-Compliance Events (eligible to receive 0%-25% of the incentive)

Generally, if a regulatory agency issues WSDOT a notice of violation for a permit that was obtained for the I-405, SR520 to SR522 Stage 1 Project, the Design-Builder shall not receive any portion of this incentive. However, the Design-Builder may be eligible to receive up to 25% of this incentive if the PET and ADO recognize unique circumstances that indicate the Design-Builder acted in the best interest of the environment during the event and/or to remedy a non-compliance event.

No portion of this incentive shall be awarded if the Design-Builder fails to take corrective action to remedy a non-compliance event after being directed by WSDOT.

Chapter 2 Technical Provisions for this project is amended as follows:

19. Section 2.1.1.2, **Definitions**, is supplemented with the following:

“Appendix (Appendices) – Where referred to in the RFP (without other reference) the term Appendix (Appendices) refers to the documents listed in RFP Appendix A1.”

20. Section 2.1.1.2, **Definitions**, the definition for **“Implementation Plan”** is revised to read:

“Implementation Plan (Also referred to as the Conceptual Kirkland Implementation Plan) – Sheet PM7B of RFP Appendix M1 and electronic design files for the vicinity of SR 520 to SR 522 provided as part of the RFP Appendix A2. These files are provided as an aid in optimizing Forward Compatibility for the Kirkland Stage 1 Project. The Implementation Plan files include alignments, pavement marking and digital terrain models (DTMs).”

The Implementation Plan represents portions of the Regional Transportation Investment District (RTID) 10-year Plan for I-405 between SR 520 and SR 522. The Implementation Plan includes, among others, the Kirkland Stage 1 and 2 projects, as well as construction of one additional 12-foot lane plus a 4-foot buffer northbound and southbound from SR 520 to SR 522. The Implementation Plan has been developed to approximately the 5% level.”

21. Section 2.1.1.2, **Definitions**, the definition for **“Kirkland Stage 2”** is revised to read:

“Kirkland Stage 2 (Also referred to as the Kirkland Stage 2 Conceptual Plan) – Shown on sheets PV7A, PV7B, RP22, RP23, and PM7A in RFP Appendix M1. In addition, electronic design files of the limits of Kirkland Stage 2 Conceptual Plan, the vicinity of SR 520 to SR 522, are provided in RFP Appendix A2. The Kirkland Stage 2 Conceptual Plan is provided as an aid in optimizing Forward Compatibility for the Kirkland Stage 1 Project.”

22. Section 2.4.2, **Additional Deviations**, the last sentence of the first paragraph is deleted.

23. Section 2.4.2, **Additional Deviations**, the third paragraph is revised as follows:

~~“Cost savings resulting from Design deviations, approved after award of the Contract to the Design-Builder, shall be treated as described in~~ addressed pursuant to General Provisions ~~Section 1-04.4 of the General Provisions.~~

24. Section 2.5.2.1, **General**, the last two sentences of this Section are deleted and replaced with the following:

“The Design-Builder, upon becoming aware of any ambiguity(ies) and/or conflict(s) relating in any way to the Mandatory Standards, shall immediately notify WSDOT of such ambiguity(ies) and/or conflict(s).”

25. Section 2.6.2, **Mandatory Standards**, the last two sentences of this Section are deleted and replaced with the following:

“The Design-Builder, upon becoming aware of any ambiguity(ies) and/or conflict(s) relating in any way to the Mandatory Standards, shall immediately notify WSDOT of such ambiguity(ies) and/or conflict(s).”

26. Section 2.7.2, **Mandatory Standards**, add the following to the end of the first paragraph:

“The Design-Builder, upon becoming aware of any ambiguity(ies) and/or conflict(s) relating in any way to the Mandatory Standards, shall immediately notify WSDOT of such ambiguity(ies) and/or conflict(s).”

27. Section 2.7.4.1, **Design Criteria**, the first bullet is deleted and replaced with the following:

- Pavement sections for reconstruction and widening shall be designed to accommodate 150 million directional ESALs (150 million in each direction). Pavement sections for ramps shall be designed to accommodate 30 million ESALs. The appropriate lane distribution factor shall be applied in accordance with the AASHTO Guide for the Design of Pavement Structures, 1993. The same distribution factor shall be applied across all lanes, i.e. the HMA and base depths shall be the same across all lanes.

28. Section 2.9.4.1, **General**, the last sentence of this Section is deleted and replaced with the following:

“The Design-Builder, upon becoming aware of any ambiguity(ies) and/or conflict(s) relating in any way to the Mandatory Standards, shall immediately notify WSDOT of such ambiguity(ies) and/or conflict(s).”

29. Section 2.10.7.4.1, **Utilities That Shall Not Be Relocated, 72-inch King County Wastewater Sewer**, in the third paragraph, the reference to “five calendar days” is revised to read “seven calendar days”.

30. Section 2.11.3, **Performance Requirements**, the second paragraph is deleted and replaced with the following:

In addition to completing the design and construction of the improvements identified in the Kirkland Stage 1 Conceptual Plans (RFP Appendix M1), the Design-Builder shall advance the design of a half-single point urban interchange (½ SPUI) at NE 116th Street Interchange as shown in the Kirkland Stage 2 Conceptual Plans (RFP Appendix M1). The Design-Builder shall obtain approval for the Channelization Plan for both the full length of Kirkland Stage 1 and the Kirkland Stage 2, ½ SPUI, located at NE 116th Street. The design of the half-diamond interchange and the ½ SPUI shall be developed so that the roadway profile, paving, retaining walls, and bridge constructed under Kirkland Stage 1 will not require removal or reconstruction under the Kirkland Stage 2 or the Implementation Plan. The Design-Builder is not responsible for construction of the ½ SPUI shown on the Kirkland Stage 2 Conceptual Plan.

31. Section 2.11.3, **Performance Requirements**, the third paragraph of this section is deleted.

32. Section 2.11.4.1.4, **Design Decision Memoranda**, the second sentence is revised as follows:

They identify the decisions made during the development of the design Conceptual Design and are provided to facilitate review and understanding of the Conceptual Plans.

33. Section 2.11.4.1.14, **Retaining Wall 3005**, is supplemented with the following:

"Retaining Wall 3005 shall be constructed integral with Noise Wall R2B. The combined wall, RW 3005/NW R2B shall be constructed within 5-feet of the easterly Right-of-Way limit."

34. Section 2.11.5.4, the third and fourth bullets are revised to read respectively:

- Technical Memoranda
- Completed Design Parameter Table – At a minimum one set (Mainline, Off-ramp/On-ramp, CD and Local Road) must be completed for each interchange included in the Design-Build contract.

35. Section 2.12.2, **Mandatory Standards**, the last two sentences of this Section are deleted and replaced with the following:

"The Design-Builder, upon becoming aware of any ambiguity(ies) and/or conflict(s) relating in any way to the Mandatory Standards, shall immediately notify WSDOT of such ambiguity(ies) and/or conflict(s)."

36. Section 2.13.2.1, **Mandatory Standards List**, the last two sentences of this Section are deleted and replaced with the following:

"The Design-Builder, upon becoming aware of any ambiguity(ies) and/or conflict(s) relating in any way to the Mandatory Standards, shall immediately notify WSDOT of such ambiguity(ies) and/or conflict(s)."

37. Section 2.14.2, **Mandatory Standards**, the last sentence of the first paragraph is deleted and replaced with the following:

"The Design-Builder, upon becoming aware of any ambiguity(ies) and/or conflict(s) relating in any way to the Mandatory Standards, shall immediately notify WSDOT of such ambiguity(ies) and/or conflict(s)."

38. Section 2.14.4.1.13, **Interface with 72" Sewer Main**, is revised as follows:

2.14.4.1.13 Interface with 72-Inch Sewer Main

With regard to the ~~conveyance~~ vault discharge conveyance for detention vault C1.2, shown on sheets DR5 and DR6 of the Conceptual Plans, RFP Appendix M1, construction of a new lift station(s) and/or the addition of a siphon(s) is prohibited. Replacement of the existing siphon is permissible provided that the new siphon accommodates the existing siphon and the vault discharge conveyance flows.

39. Section 2.15.3, **Mandatory Standards and Reference Documents**, the last sentence of this Section is deleted and replaced with the following:

"The Design-Builder, upon becoming aware of any ambiguity(ies) and/or conflict(s) relating in any way to the Mandatory Standards, shall immediately notify WSDOT of such ambiguity(ies) and/or conflict(s)."

40. Section 2.16.2.1, **General**, the last two sentences of this Section are deleted and replaced with the following:

"The Design-Builder, upon becoming aware of any ambiguity(ies) and/or conflict(s) relating in any way to the Mandatory Standards, shall immediately notify WSDOT of such ambiguity(ies) and/or conflict(s)."

41. Section 2.17.2.1, **General**, the last two sentences of this Section are deleted and replaced with the following:
- "The Design-Builder, upon becoming aware of any ambiguity(ies) and/or conflict(s) relating in any way to the Mandatory Standards, shall immediately notify WSDOT of such ambiguity(ies) and/or conflict(s)."
42. Section 2.18.2.1, **General**, the last two sentences of this Section are deleted and replaced with the following:
- "The Design-Builder, upon becoming aware of any ambiguity(ies) and/or conflict(s) relating in any way to the Mandatory Standards, shall immediately notify WSDOT of such ambiguity(ies) and/or conflict(s)."
43. Section 2.19.2.1, **General**, the last two sentences of this Section are deleted and replaced with the following:
- "The Design-Builder, upon becoming aware of any ambiguity(ies) and/or conflict(s) relating in any way to the Mandatory Standards, shall immediately notify WSDOT of such ambiguity(ies) and/or conflict(s)."
44. Section 2.20.2.1, **General**, the last two sentences of this Section are deleted and replaced with the following:
- "The Design-Builder, upon becoming aware of any ambiguity(ies) and/or conflict(s) relating in any way to the Mandatory Standards, shall immediately notify WSDOT of such ambiguity(ies) and/or conflict(s)."
45. Section 2.21.2.1, **General**, the last two sentences of the first paragraph are deleted and replaced with the following:
- "The Design-Builder, upon becoming aware of any ambiguity(ies) and/or conflict(s) relating in any way to the Mandatory Standards, shall immediately notify WSDOT of such ambiguity(ies) and/or conflict(s)."
46. Section 2.22.2.1, **General**, the last two sentences of this Section are deleted and replaced with the following:
- "The Design-Builder, upon becoming aware of any ambiguity(ies) and/or conflict(s) relating in any way to the Mandatory Standards, shall immediately notify WSDOT of such ambiguity(ies) and/or conflict(s)."
47. Section 2.23, **Railroad**, entire Section, all references to "Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway Company" are revised to read "BNSF Railway Company".
48. Section 2.23.1, **General**, contact information listed on page 2.23-1 is revised as follows:
- Insert "Ahmer Nizam" between the lines "WSDOT Railroad Liaison" and "Railroad Engineer".
 - Replace "J.M. (Mike) Cowles" with "Dan McDonald". The email address for Mr. McDonald is currently not available.

49. Section 2.24.2.1, **Mandatory Standards**, the third sentence of the first paragraph is deleted.

50. Section 2.24.2.1, **Mandatory Standards**, the second, third and fourth paragraphs are deleted and replaced with the following:

"The Design-Builder, upon becoming aware of any ambiguity(ies) and/or conflict(s) relating in any way to the Mandatory Standards, shall immediately notify WSDOT of such ambiguity(ies) and/or conflict(s)."

51. Section 2.25.2, **Mandatory Standards**, the last sentence of the first paragraph is deleted and replaced with the following:

"The Design-Builder, upon becoming aware of any ambiguity(ies) and/or conflict(s) relating in any way to the Mandatory Standards, shall immediately notify WSDOT of such ambiguity(ies) and/or conflict(s)."

52. Section 2.28.5.1, **General**, the last paragraph, titled **Construction Activities**, is deleted and replaced with the following:

Construction Activities

The QMP shall address a program for inspections of all Work, including examinations, measurements, and tests of material or elements for each Work operation, where appropriate, to verify quality. The requirement for these inspections is not limited to those required for quality testing purposes.

Released For Construction Documents shall indicate specific mandatory inspection points, requiring a witness for inspection, and or approval by the Construction Quality Assurance Manager, and/or the designated representative, prior to beginning work.

When construction activities do not meet the specifications, and when material properties failures occur, the QMP shall address the re-testing procedures, with pre-approved rework/repair procedures. Examples of these pre-approved re-testing and/or rework/repair procedures include, but are not limited to, the following anticipated failures:

Soil

- Lack of compaction
- Subgrade too wet
- Material out of specification
- Soil too wet

Hot Mix Asphalt

- Out of specification materials
- Low density

Rebar

- Poor or incorrect locations
- Insufficient or lack of support
- Broken or displaced

Concrete

- Out of specification slump
- Improper cold weather curing
- Rock pockets, small and large

The Design-Builder shall add re-testing and/or rework/repair procedures to the QMP during the execution of the Project as repetitive non-conformances are identified.

The Appendices to the Request For Proposal for this project are amended as follows:

53. Appendix A1, RFP Documents, remove and replace with the attached.
54. Appendix A2, remove and replace the cover and index with the attached. Electronic files [3ex157a251d_bm.dgn](#) and [3ex158a250z_esa.dgn](#) are updated with this addendum. [3ex157a251d_bm.dgn](#) includes the updated location of the King County Sanitary Sewer in the vicinity of Detention Vault C1.2. [3ex158a250z_esa.dgn](#) provides location of two previously unidentified wetlands in the vicinity of Detention Pond C1.1.
55. Appendix B1, Section 2-02.3 is supplemented with the following:

Asbestos Handling And Disposal

Prior to performance of any contract work that may include the handling and disposal of asbestos, the Contractor shall obtain all permits from, and provide notification to, the Washington State Department of Labor and Industries, the U.S. EPA, the local air pollution control agency, and other permitting and regulatory agencies with jurisdiction over the work involving asbestos as the law requires.

Prior to commencing asbestos related work, the Contractor shall provide the Engineer with written verification of approvals and notifications that have been given and/or obtained from the required jurisdictional agencies, and the Contractor's schedule for all work involving asbestos removal. The schedule shall include the sequencing and scheduling of asbestos related work, and coordination with subcontractors. The Contractor shall notify the Engineer when all approvals have been received and notifications have been made, as required by the agencies involved.

The Contractor shall ensure the safety of all workers, visitors to the site, and the general public in accordance with all applicable laws, rules, and regulations.

The Contractor shall designate a Washington State Certified Asbestos Supervisor (CAS) to personally supervise the asbestos removal and to ensure that the handling and removal of asbestos is accomplished by certified asbestos workers, pursuant to Washington State Department of Labor and Industries standards. The Contractor shall ensure that the removal and disposal of asbestos meets the requirements of EPA regulation 40 CFR Part 61, local health department regulations, and all other applicable regulations.

Brian D. Nielsen, P.E.
Contract Manager